

**E-Filing**

1 KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321)  
United States Attorney

2 EUMII L. CHOI (WVSBN 0722)  
3 Chief, Criminal Division

4 SUSAN KNIGHT (CSBN 209013)  
Assistant United States Attorney

5 150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900  
6 San Jose, California 95113  
7 Telephone: (408) 535-5056  
8 FAX: (408) 535-5066  
Susan.Knight@usdoj.gov

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
12 SAN JOSE DIVISION  
13

14 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )

15 Plaintiff, )

16 v. )

17 MARGARITA ZAMORA-CUIDAS, )

18 Defendant. )  
19 \_\_\_\_\_ )  
20  
21

No. CR 06-00258 JF

[PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME  
FROM THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT  
CALCULATION (18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A)  
& 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv))

22 On April 13, 2006, the parties appeared before the Court for a detention hearing and an  
23 arraignment on an indictment. After the defendant was arraigned and entered a plea of not guilty,  
24 the parties scheduled an appearance before the Honorable Judge Fogel on May 10, 2006 at 9:00  
25 a.m. Assistant United States Attorney Susan Knight then requested an exclusion of time under  
26 the Speedy Trial Act from April 13, 2006 until May 10, 2006 in order for the government to  
27 provide discovery to Assistant Federal Public Defender Jay Rorty. The defendant, through  
28 AFD Rorty, agreed to the exclusion. The parties stipulated and agreed that an exclusion under

[PROPOSED] ORDER TO EXCLUDE TIME  
CR 06-00258 JF

1 the Speedy Trial Act was appropriate based on the defendant's need for effective preparation of  
2 counsel.

3 SO STIPULATED.

KEVIN V. RYAN  
United States Attorney

4 DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
SUSAN KNIGHT  
Assistant United States Attorney

6 DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
JAY RORTY  
Assistant Federal Public Defender

9  
10 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the time between April 13, 2006 and  
11 May 10, 2006 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act. The Court finds that the failure to grant  
12 the requested continuance would deny the defendant effective preparation of counsel. The Court  
13 finds that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best  
14 interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal  
15 cases. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C.  
16 §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18  
19 Dated

4/14/06

\_\_\_\_\_  
PATRICIA V. TRUMBULL  
United States Magistrate Judge